

I read a commentator who quoted Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz, in what the commentator thought was a damning admission on this story, when he said:

Yes, we had other reasons for going into Iraq, but we stressed weapons of mass destruction because that was the one everybody was focused on.

According to the commentator, that is a damning admission on the part of the Secretary that we had other motives, and that is part of the attack that is being mounted on the floor, that the Bush administration was duplicitous: They told us they were going after weapons of mass destruction, but they had other motives. And here, Secretary Wolfowitz has admitted it; a smoking gun.

Back to my memory. I remember very clearly that the Bush administration openly and directly said they had other motives. Let me go down them as I remember them.

Weapons of mass destruction—there are many countries that have weapons of mass destruction. If we were to go after the country in the world, other than ourselves, that has the highest stock of weapons of mass destruction, we would go after Russia. Why don't we? Because weapons of mass destruction alone are by no means justification for attacking another nation. They must be tied to other motives. This is what I am sure Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz was talking about.

Right now President Putin and President Bush have a good relationship. Russia and the United States have a trusting relationship. Why should we attack Russia just because it has weapons of mass destruction when that relationship exists?

Iraq was ruled by a tyrant, and not just your everyday tyrant but a brutal, bloody tyrant who had demonstrated that he not only possessed weapons of mass destruction, he was willing to use weapons of mass destruction and has done so—the only person in the world whose government has employed weapons of mass destruction against anyone else—in this case it was his own people—in the last half century. So, yes, there are other motives besides possessing weapons of mass destruction. They are the man's personality and his history.

We are not just interested in nations that have WMD. We are interested in brutal tyrants who will use weapons of mass destruction.

Next, Iraq was clearly a crossroads of terrorist activity. That is what Senator GRAHAM referred to, not just al-Qaida. Iraq was one of the principal financial supporters of the terrorist suicide bombings in Palestine. They offered a \$100,000 reward to anyone who would kill himself as long as he took a few Jews with him. How many tyrants around the world are willing to harbor terrorists and support terrorists? The list gets a little smaller.

North Korea has weapons of mass destruction. North Korea is ruled by a

brutal tyrant. But North Korea has not invaded any of its neighbors for half a century, and North Korea is not a haven for al-Qaida, Hamas, Hezbollah, and the other terrorist organizations. We are closing down here on the other motives.

Attacking your neighbors. Saddam Hussein has attacked his neighbors twice in the last dozen years, set off two major wars, and is responsible for killing more Muslims than any other person on the planet.

The other motives that the Bush administration had in dealing with Iraq were the totality of the situation. Yes, they wanted to deal with WMD. Yes, they wanted to deal with a tyrant who was brutalizing his own people. Yes, they wanted to deal with terrorism. And, yes, they wanted to deal with somebody who was threatening his neighbors. If you take that criteria and apply it to all the countries in the world, you come up with only one that qualifies on every count.

It was not the single issue that current commentators and candidates, pundits and pollsters are talking about that prompted President Bush to give the order to go ahead in Iraq. It is a distortion of history to hammer again and again on the fraud that says only weapons of mass destruction drove us to go into Iraq, and it is our failure to find weapons of mass destruction in this time period in Iraq that demonstrates we were wrong.

Nobody has gone to the last part of that sentence. Nobody has said yet that we were wrong to have taken out Saddam Hussein. They come close to that in their attack on the President. They say he lied. They say he manipulated. They say he distorted. But they cannot quite bring themselves to say we were wrong to have done it, and no one will say the world would have been a better place if we had not. Why? Because we have discovered some other things we did not know.

If you are going to talk about intelligence failures, our intelligence community did not know until we got into Iraq about the mass graves. We did not know about the prisons holding children who were put in there as young as 4 and 5 years of age and have been there for 5 years or more.

We did not know the details of the brutality of this man. We did not know that he treated his own population, those who were hostile to him or, indeed, simply suspect in his eyes, as brutally as Adolf Hitler treated the Jews in World War II in Germany. We did not know that. We have discovered that now. So no one will quite go to the point of saying we made a mistake, that Bush did the wrong thing.

One commentator closed his attack on the Bush administration with this interesting quibble, in my view. He said: It was the right war but it was fought for the wrong reason. I find it very difficult to reconcile those two. If it was the right war and has achieved the right result, it was the right thing

to have done, and it was the right thing to have done for all of the reasons that people who hate this administration are now conveniently forgetting all of the historical buildup to this that has gone down the memory hole that people are now conveniently saying never happened.

This is a historic Chamber, and it has seen all kinds of debates, high and low. It has seen all standards of rhetoric, good and bad, and, yes, if I may, true and false. There has been a call for the rafters here to be ringing in a discussion of the Iraqi war and America's activity. I wanted to answer that call and do what I can to see that the rafters are ringing with the truth; that the rafters are ringing with real history, not invented history; that the rafters are ringing with a recognition that what the Bush administration has done in Iraq was the right thing to have done; it was based on sound and careful analysis that ran over two administrations; that was vetted thoroughly with our allies abroad, bringing Great Britain, Australia, Poland, and others, into the fight, and the result has demonstrated that the world is a safer place.

The Iraqi people live in a safer society, and the prospects for the future are better than would have been the case if we had gone to the brink, as President Clinton did, and then changed our minds. President Clinton thought the evidence was overwhelming but decided not to act. President Bush thought the evidence was overwhelming and did act, and the rafters should ring with at least one speech that applauds that decision and that level of leadership.

I say to my colleagues, I say to the country, I say to my constituents, I believe the history is there that justifies the decision, and I believe the evidence is there after the fact that more than justifies the decision.

In this case, America and her President can stand proud before the world as having done the right thing for the right reason.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING ROBERT AND ERMA BYRD ON THEIR 66TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last Thursday marked an important—and